

Remarks

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the allowance of claims 16-17 and the allowability of claims 5-6 and 10.

Objections to the claims

Claims 5-6 and 10 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 5 and 10 have been re-written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 6 (which depends from re-presented claim 5) and 10 are now in a form for allowance.

Rejections of claims 1, 3-4 and 15

Claims 1, 3-4 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Errico¹ in view of Lyon².

Claims 1, 3 and 4 have been canceled from the application without prejudice, obviating their rejection.

Claim 15 has been amended to depend from the now allowable claim 5, and thus Applicant submits claim 15 is similarly patentable over the cited art and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground for rejection.

Rejection of claim 2

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Errico and Lyon in further view of Akiyama³.

¹ U.S. Patent No. 5,796,924 to Errico, *et al.*

² U.S. Patent No. 5,903,884 to Lyon, *et al.*

³ U.S. Patent No. 5,602,938 to Akiyama, *et al.*

Claim 2 has been canceled from the application without prejudice, thereby obviating this rejection.

Rejections of claims 7-9

Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Errico and Lyon in further view of Watanabe⁴.

Claims 8-9 depend from claim 7, which has been amended to depend from patentable claim 5, as amended. In this light, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground for rejection of claims 7-9.

Rejections of claims 11-12

Claims 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsburg⁵ in view of Filipski⁶.

In a 21 June 2004 telephone conversation between the Examiner and Applicant's representative, Applicant's representative proposed the amendment made herein to claim 11, which imports the substantive limitations of patentable claim 5, as amended, into claim 11. Applicant, thus, submits that claim 11, and claim 12 which depends therefrom, are similarly patentable over the cited art.

Rejections of claims 13-14

Claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsburg in view of Filipski and further in view of Watanabe.

Claims 13 and 14 contain all of the limitations of the now patentable claim 11, as amended, and thus, it is respectfully submitted, claims 13 and 14 are similarly patentable over the cited art.

⁴ U.S. Patent No. 5,754,681 to Watanabe, *et al.*


⁵ U.S. Patent No. 3,993,976 to Ginsburg, Arthur P.

⁶ U.S. Patent No. 4,975,975 to Filipski, Alan

Applicant respectfully submits that the above remarks clearly establish the patentability of the invention as recited in claims 5-17 over the prior art. Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. Should there be any questions after reviewing this paper, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 617-854-4000.

Dated: June 22, 2004

Respectfully submitted,
H. JOHN CAULFIELD, Applicant

By: 
Jacob N. Erlich
Reg. No. 24,338
Attorney for Applicant

10050-102_RespB_062104